United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,422	08/15/2001	Peter Ar-Fu Lam	BPCODE2	1550
7590 09/25/2007 Peter Ar-Fu Lam 20104 Wayne Ave. Torrance, CA 90503		EXAMINER		
		BUCHANAN, CHRISTOPHER R		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
•				
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,422	LAM, PETER AR-FU	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher R. Buchanan	3627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-34 and 36-51 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-5,19-39,41-48,50 and 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,6-18,40 and 49 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	nd 51 is/are withdrawn from constitution election requirement. Septed or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	.xaminer. 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dal 5) Notice of Informal Pa	e	

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

1. The rejections of claim 40 under Spackova et al. in view of Runton et al. and under Jones in view of Runton et al. have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 6-18, 40, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spackova et al. (US 4,539,585) in view of Powell (US 6,067,526).

Regarding claim 40, Spackova discloses a method of processing a body profile (BP) code describing the physical dimensions of a human body to facilitate garment shopping, the method including the steps of;

- (1) defining m different physical dimensional parameters of said human body (the indicia segments (72) and coded indicia (74) are used to define various physical parameters of a subject wearing a form fitting garment, col. 4 line 1+, see Fig. 3),
- (2) measuring a physical dimension of said body to produce m values for each of said m defined parameters (the orientation of each segment (72) and indicia (74) are computer identified (i.e., measured and stored, col. 4 line 7+) and used to provide a body location on which items of apparel should be worn (col. 4 line 18+), wherein

Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

orientation includes rotation and position (col. 3 line 54+), this constitutes measuring the body and producing values for the parameters); and

(3) processing said m values to produce a multiple digits BP code for representing said m values (the form fitting garment (71) contains a plurality of coded segments (72) which are used *in toto* to form a composite image of the garment and, therefore, of the subject's body since the garment is form fitting (col. 4 line 1+), the stored data for the composite image would result in a multi-digit code that represents the particular features (m values) for that body).

Regarding claim 1, a number of sizes are available for garments and the BP code is used to determine a correct fit for the subject's body (col. 4 line 15+). The exact manner by which the correct fit is determined (chart, image matching, etc.) would be a matter of design choice.

The method of Spackova differs from the claimed method in that the body profile code is not explicitly shown to be a compressed code (claim 40) or to include a primary compressed n1 digits code and a supplemental n2 digits code for representing said m values, wherein said n2 digits code further comprises a n3 digits code (claims 6-18 and 49).

Powell discloses translating data into a compressed code (binary format packets) to enable the data to be portable and easily transmitted over a computer network (see abstract, col. 7 line 45+). Powell also discloses the use of independent digits (N1 and N2) to segregate data and further discloses cross correlation of the network addressing code (col. 9 line 13+) to define the nature or relationship between data bit packets.

Art Unit: 3627

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Spackova so that the body profile code is a compressed code and to include independent digits to segregate data, as taught by Powell, to make the code easier to store and transmit on a computer network. The examiner further notes that the feature of compressed code is an old expedient in the art and official notice is hereby taken of the use of compression data.

Furthermore, regarding claims 6-18 and 49, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the different data strings (n1 and n2 codes) could be used for a variety of applications (garment fitting, data manipulation, etc). In the examiner's view, the particular application selected for the n1 and n2 data strings (e.g., size chart for fitting purposes, enhance resolution, physical dimensional parameter, non-dimensional related information related to said human-body, out of range information of a parameter, etc.) would be a matter of design choice, and, therefore, that limitation would not hold patentable weight.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed June 25, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the prior art references used in the rejection do not disclose all of the claimed features of the instant invention. Applicant further argues that the rejection does not clearly point out the location in the prior art where particular limitations can be found and that a proper explanation of the examiner's interpretation and reasoning is not provided.

Art Unit: 3627

The examiner disagrees and stands by the rejection. The rejection above has been modified to include a detailed explanation of the examiner's interpretation of limitations disclosed in the prior art and the examiner's reasoning.

5. The applicant has inquired as to the possibility of double patenting occurring with the related US patent 7,194,327 issued to Lam. In the examiner's view, independent claim 40 of the instant application would involve nonstatutory (obviousness-type) double patenting with claim 1 of the Lam patent. If claim 40 of the application was allowed in its current state, a terminal disclaimer would be necessary.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3627

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Buchanan whose telephone number is 571-272-8134. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CB

F. RYAN ZEENDER PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 6